

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF
COUNSELING PRACTICUM SUPERVISOR OFFERED FACILITATIVE
CONDITIONS ON SUPERVISEE SELF-EXPLORATION

By

William James Lennon, Jr.

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE
COUNCIL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

University of Florida
1972



UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA



3 1262 08552 7587

IN LOVE TO MY PARENTS

The late William James Lennon and Rita Evelyn Grady Lennon
whose love of their son has made it possible for him
to love others

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study and what it culminates is first and foremost a function of the untiring and unquestioning love, faith, acceptance, and sacrifice of my beloved wife, Geraldine. Also, this study is built upon the support of many other helping persons. My special thanks are expressed to Robert O. Stripling, Chairman of my Supervisory Committee, for his constructive criticisms and for making himself available when most needed.

My appreciation is extended to other members of my Supervisory Committee, Dr. Ben Barger who shared his wisdom and Dr. Bruce Thomason who gave encouragement. In particular, I would like to thank Dr. William Ware and Mr. Darryl Downing for the help they gave me in analyzing the experiment.

A special debt of gratitude is also acknowledged to the following persons for their invaluable contributions: to Dr. Harry Grater and Dr. Paul Schauble who acted as supervisors; to Mrs. Cindy Dewey and Dr. Lynwood Small who served as raters; to Dr. James Lister for his support and numerous constructive criticisms; to the counseling students who unselfishly gave of their time to serve as supervisees; and to Mrs. Muriel Lee and Mrs. Maybeth Phillips who acted as proctors.

In addition, I wish to acknowledge the sacrifices made by my dear children, William (Billy), Rita Lorene, and Geraldine Kathleen; by my loving and inspirational mother, Rita Grady Lennon; and my father and mother-in-law, Buford and Lemer Schnittker. I also wish to recognize the help of my dear Aunt Anna Lennon and my Aunt and Uncle, Joe and May Cruise. Finally, I wish to thank all those many loving, accepting, and genuine friends and clients whom I haven't acknowledged by name but who can carry in their hearts the knowledge that they have touched my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
ABSTRACT.....	viii
CHAPTER I	
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	1
Importance of Supervision.....	2
Purpose of Study.....	5
CHAPTER II	
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	8
Conceptual Considerations.....	8
Research Evidence.....	12
CHAPTER III	
DESIGN OF STUDY AND RESULTS.....	27
Hypothesis.....	27
Subjects.....	28
Supervisors.....	31
Selection and Preparation of Raters.....	33
Experimental Treatment.....	35
Data Collection and Analysis.....	38
Summary.....	56
CHAPTER IV	
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS....	57
Summary.....	57
Conclusions.....	61
Implications.....	63
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	65
APPENDICES.....	73
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	89

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Mean Ratings of Supervisee Counseling Excerpts.....	30
2	Mean Ratings of Supervisor Counseling Excerpts.....	32
3	Rater Reliability Ratings for Empathy Analysis of Variance on Ratings for Empathy.....	40
4	Rater Reliability Ratings for Respect Analysis of Variance on Ratings for Respect.....	41
5	Rater Reliability Ratings for Genuineness Analysis of Variance on Ratings for Genuineness.....	42
6	Rater Reliability Ratings for Depth of Self-Exploration Analysis of Variance on Ratings for Depth of Self-Exploration.....	43
7	Analysis of Variance on Empathy Scores.....	46
8	Analysis of Variance on Respect Scores.....	47
9	Analysis of Variance on Genuineness Scores.....	48
10	Analysis of Variance on Depth of Self-Exploration Scores.....	49
11	Means for Phases, Order, and Segments Means for Main Effects.....	50
12	Tukey's Multiple Comparison on Levels of Empathy Offered by Supervisor A.....	52

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table		Page
13	Tukey's Multiple Comparison on Levels of Empathy Offered by Supervisor B.....	52
14	Tukey's Multiple Comparison on Levels of Respect Offered by Supervisor A.....	53
15	Tukey's Multiple Comparison on Levels of Respect Offered by Supervisor B.....	53
16	Tukey's Multiple Comparison on Levels of Genuineness Offered by Supervisor A...	55
17	Tukey's Multiple Comparison on Levels of Genuineness Offered by Supervisor B...	55

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate
Council of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF
COUNSELING PRACTICUM SUPERVISOR OFFERED FACILITATIVE
CONDITIONS ON SUPERVISEE SELF-EXPLORATION

By

William James Lennon, Jr.

August, 1972

Chairman: Dr. Robert O. Stripling
Major Department: Counselor Education

This study was designed to investigate the following question: What effect does practicum supervisor offered levels of empathy, respect, and genuineness have on the depth of self-exploration of practicum students? In order to answer this question certain conditions were established. Specifically, two practicum supervisors, during controlled supervisory sessions, offered, on a pre-determined sequence, to their supervisees high and low levels of empathy and respect. After it was determined that the high and low levels of offered conditions did, in fact, differ significantly ($p < .05$) the following null hypothesis was tested:

There will be no significant difference in supervisee levels of self-exploration under conditions of high and low levels of supervisor offered respect and empathy.

The subjects were four graduate students in the counselor education program at the University of Florida who were currently offering, in counseling, an average level of accurate empathy, respect, and genuineness below 3.0, as measured by the Carkhuff Scales. Two practicum supervisors were selected from members of the faculty of the University of Florida who were offering, in counseling, levels of respect, accurate empathy, and genuineness above 3.0.

Two experienced raters were instructed to evaluate the effects of the experimental treatment by rating audio tapes of supervisor offered levels of facilitative conditions and supervisee levels of depth of self-exploration during supervisory periods I, II, and III.

The data were analyzed by using a four-way cross classification analysis of variance. The same analysis was performed on each of the four dependent variables, empathy, respect, genuineness, and depth of self-exploration. The analyses of the data for the empathy, respect, genuineness, and self-exploration scores showed that only the interaction between phases and order was significant ($p < .01$).

Tukey's multiple comparison procedure was used to test whether there was any difference between the first, middle, and last third of the supervisory sessions with regard to empathy scores, respect scores, and

genuineness scores. The results of the comparison showed that high levels differed significantly ($p < .05$) from low levels in every variable, but that no difference was detected between the two high levels or the two low levels. These tests revealed two findings: first, that both supervisors were able to provide high and low levels of empathy and respect which differed significantly ($p < .05$); second, that both supervisors were unsuccessful in the attempt to maintain their normal levels of genuineness while offering differing levels of empathy and respect.

Supervisee levels of self-exploration under low and high conditions were compared using a simple t-test and were found to be significantly different ($p < .001$). The results of the comparisons revealed that high levels of supervisor offered respect and empathy facilitated deeper levels of supervisee self-exploration than did low supervisor offered conditions. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The major implication is that practicum supervisor offered facilitative conditions have a significant effect on supervisee self-exploration in the natural setting of practicum supervision. This study also implies that, without prior preparation, supervisors functioning, in counseling, above a 3.0 level of facilitative conditions are able to offer high and low levels of respect and empathy which differ significantly ($p < .01$). In addition,

this study suggests that, without prior preparation, supervisors are unable to maintain their normally high levels of genuineness when offering different levels of respect and empathy. Finally, this study implies that practicum students functioning, in counseling, below a 3.0 level of facilitative conditions may be unable to sense the differential offering of high and low supervisor levels of respect, empathy, and genuineness.

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The practicum experience is that dimension of the counselor education program charged with the task of developing the student's basic repertoire of counseling skills. It is perceived as an opportunity for the counselor candidate to integrate his or her knowledge of counseling theory into a unique way of professional being. Theoretical constructs acquired through scholarly study are expected to be translated into health-engendering interpersonal skills.

Practicum supervision provides a unique academic experience to enhance one's growth as a counselor through, in part, the process of self-exploration. Blane (1968) has stated, "The practicum has taken on such a central role in counselor education that supervision has emerged as one of the most critical phases in the preparation of counselors."

The *raison d'être* of the supervised counseling experience is derived from the fact that counseling and/or psychotherapy, according to some educators (Colby, 1964; Ekstein and Wallerstein, 1958; Kelz, 1966),

is, in part, an art which requires an apprenticeship if its skills are to be learned. Blane (1968) noted that the very "...existence of an apprenticeship implies that some amount of learning is passed from master to apprentice via a shared experience."

Importance of Supervision

The importance of facilitative practicum supervisory experiences has long been recognized as essential for the education of effective psychological counselors. As early as 1961, the American Personnel and Guidance Association issued a policy statement recommending that supervised practice consume approximately one-fourth of the total counselor education program. In a revised statement (APGA, 1967) supervised experiences are viewed as "an integral part of the total counselor education program." Moreover, the Committee on Counselor Effectiveness of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision has identified supervision as one of the most critical factors in the education of effective counselors (ACES, 1969).

Further acknowledgement, by professional organizations, of the importance of supervised counseling experiences is evident in the report by Hoch, Ross, and Windy (1966) on the proceedings of the Conference on the Professional Preparation of Clinical Psychologists, which states:

With near unanimity the Conference reaffirmed the principle that in order to qualify as acceptable, a clinical psychology training program must include a pre-doctoral clinical internship of at least one year....

Supervision has repeatedly been identified by counselor educators as an important core dimension of the practicum experience (Heimann, 1965; Munger and Cash, 1963; Peters and Hansen, 1963; Walz and Roeber, 1962). Bryn (1962) has stated, for example, that supervision of practicum student counseling behavior, so that the fledgling counselor can learn from his experiences, is essential to effective counselor education. Moreover, Hall and Warren (1956), in a monograph summarizing the Charlottesville Conference on Rehabilitation Counselor Training, stated:

In addition to his academic training, the education of the rehabilitation counselor should include participation in a systematic program of supervised practice. Such practice is, in some respects, the most important phase of the training program. Without it, the trainee may be partially or totally incapable of assuming his expected role of conducting an effective counseling relationship.

Not only counselor educators but also students perceive practicum and supervision as a vital aspect of counselor education. Surveying a group of 50 student counselors, Harmon and Arnold (1960) found that between one-fourth and one-third mentioned more supervised counseling experience as a suggestion for improvement

of counselor education programs. In a similar view, two years after the termination of a National Defense Education Act Institute, students identified the counseling practicum as the most meaningful experience they had encountered (Munger, Brown, and Needham, 1964). Blane (1968) summed up the feelings of many student counselors when he wrote:

...of all the areas contributing to the preparation of counselors, one area-- practicum experience and supervision-- appears to be of most concern to students, as well as most helpful to them.

Research, also, is beginning to suggest the importance the supervisory experiences play in the education of counselors and therapists. Evidence indicates that the level of facilitative conditions offered by a counselor is related to constructive client therapeutic process movement and outcomes. Counselors who offer the highest levels of empathy, positive regard, and genuineness, to name but a few dimensions, have clients who explore themselves most deeply and demonstrate the greatest amount of constructive personality change (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967; Truax and Carkhuff, 1965).

Drawing upon the findings of Truax and Carkhuff, Pierce and Schauble (1970) found that interns at a college counseling center made significant gains in the facilitative core only when they had individual supervisors who were themselves offering high levels of empathy,

positive regard, and genuineness. Where subjects had supervisors who were low on these dimensions they did not gain. In this case "...individual supervisors were found to have a potent shaping influence on supervisee behavior."

Numerous articles have been written relative to supervision; however, research regarding this topic is sparse (Hansen and Warner, 1971). Lister (1966b) has stated:

Rigorous evaluative research is needed in counselor education. We know some of the changes candidates undergo during preparation programs, but we have not clearly identified the causes of such changes. This need is particularly acute for supervision. Needed are clear statements--even if conflicting--of desired outcomes of supervision. Ultimately, process outcome research is needed to isolate the supervisory variables which are antecedent conditions of desirable candidate behavior.

Hansen and Barker (1964) appeared to speak for many counselor educators, when they stated, "The real task ahead for research is to specify further the separate types of supervisor behavior and evaluate their relevance to counselor education."

Purpose of Study

In view of the importance of supervision and the need for the further investigation of "...supervisory variables which are antecedent conditions of desirable

counselor candidate behavior..." this study was designed to investigate the following questions:

(1) can practicum supervisor offered levels of empathy and respect be varied experimentally, and (2) what effect does practicum supervisor offered levels of empathy, respect, and genuineness have on the depth of self-exploration of practicum students? That such a study can contribute to the understanding of practicum supervision is derived from the assumption that self-exploration, and consequent self-awareness are essential processes in the development of effective counselors. The importance of these processes is manifest in the psychoanalytical concept of transference and counter-transference. Just as clients transfer onto their counselors feelings that they hold toward significant others in their lives, so counselors can mistakenly transfer onto their clients feelings that they hold toward their significant others.

Through the process of self-exploration, which research suggests is facilitated by high level functioning helpers, the counselor candidate is enabled to resolve effectively the counter-transference relationship.

Through deep self-exploration, he achieves a more accurate self-awareness of the intrapersonal dynamics which transpire within him due to his interactions with clients. Hence, the student counselor is better able to

discriminate perceptions that he has of his clients which are a function of his accurate understandings.

Furthermore, because of implications which can be drawn from counseling research, this study was expected to contribute to a deeper understanding of practicum supervision. Truax and Carkhuff (1965) successfully manipulated the level of facilitative conditions offered by a counselor and found patient depth of self-exploration to be a function of these conditions. Since the essence of practicum supervision is the human relationship experience, the same conditions which facilitated depth of self-exploration in counseling should also facilitate depth of self-exploration in practicum supervision.

In view of the fact that the common denominator of both counseling and supervision is the human relationship experience, the findings of Truax and Carkhuff (1965) suggest, first, that supervisor offered levels of empathy and respect are subject to experimental manipulation (holding supervisor offered genuineness constant); and second, that such a manipulation will demonstrate supervisee depth of self-exploration to be a function of these conditions.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Supervised counseling practicum has become recognized as central to the preparation of counselors. While a number of professional articles have been written relative to supervision, research on the subject is sparse. Nevertheless, through a review of the literature and research on supervision, and related topics, the necessary conceptual and research understandings have been drawn to provide the assumptions and rationale upon which the present study is based. The review of the literature focuses upon two areas, (1) the conceptual considerations of supervision, and (2) empirical research on supervision.

Conceptual Considerations

Birk (1970) states that "reported research data are generally inadequate to provide needed knowledge about some of the central issues in supervision." References to this situation have been made in commentaries by Cash and Munger (1966), Hosford (1969), and Patterson (1964) who have focused attention on the need for

extensive research in supervision. The conceptual support provided the supervisory process (Heimann, 1965; Kell and Mueller, 1966; Munger and Cash, 1963; Peters and Hansen, 1963) appears highly incongruent with the lack of research on the topic.

"Some theoretical considerations of supervision have hypothesized the merits of one orientation over the merits of another" (Birk, 1970). Hathaway (1968) reports that there are many articles in the literature concerned with supervision that, for all practical purposes, debate the question of what supervision is, or should be. The most common issue for disagreement revolves around whether supervision should be essentially a "didactic" or an "experiential" experience. Implicit in the use of the didactic model is an emphasis upon cognitive learning. Mazer and Engle (1968) take a position strongly supporting the efficacy of a cognitive emphasis; they clearly assert that the cognitive approach is the preferred approach to counselor preparation. Similarly, Clark (1965) has stated preference for a pedagogical approach to supervision, describing supervision essentially as "...a teaching situation in an academic setting."

A second dimension of the didactic orientation is its emphasis on "shaping" the philosophical and behavioral repertoire of the counselor candidate in

accord with the supervisor's belief system. While not as overtly stated as by Krasner (1962), Krumboltz (1967) also appears to support the shaping of counselor candidates' responses in accordance with the theoretical beliefs of the supervisor.

On the other hand, while the adherents to an experiential approach do not dismiss the cognitive dimension of supervision (Altucher, 1967; Lister, 1966a; Sanderson, 1954), they consider it secondary to the more critical factor of the emotional experience. According to Altucher (1967), "significant supervision learning takes place in situations where one's feelings are engaged." Lister (1966a) has emphasized the importance of counselor's awareness of their immediate experiencing. Gysbers, when he emphasized the centrality of "trust" within the supervisory experience (1963) and supported the exploration of a supervisee's "need system" (1964), placed the same importance on feelings. Likewise, Kell and Mueller (1966) articulated the belief that one of the means a counselor educator can utilize to facilitate counselor growth is "by helping the counselor to differentiate his own feelings and conflicts from those of the client."

In support of the experiential approach, Hoch, Ross, and Windy (1966) have written:

There is need for encouraging and assisting each student to develop awareness of his own personality and behavior, his effects upon others, ability to suspend judgment, tolerance for error (by self and others), and similar characteristics. Psychotherapy, sensitivity training, clinical supervision, and role playing are among the means to these ends.

Ekstein and Wallerstein (1958) acknowledged a concerned cognizance of the conflicts, needs, and past learning which supervisor and supervisee bring to the supervisory session.

The possibility that such individual differences lead to differential outcomes is exemplified in their observation that some counselors deny all that the supervisor suggests in an attempt to ward off the impact of the supervisor while other supervisees show complete submission and complete acquiescence to supervisor suggestions (Birk, 1970).

Several years later, Ekstein (1964) introduced a supervisory model in which the focus for the supervisee was learning rather than psychotherapy.

Rogers (1957) has urged that the counselor candidate be encouraged to develop his own orientation to counseling or therapy out of his unique experience. A number of authorities (Clark, 1965; Gysbers and Johnston, 1965; Patterson, 1964; Rogers, 1961; Walz, 1963; Walz, Roeber, and Gysbers, 1963) argue that this "experience" in counselor preparation should be in the context of supervisor offered conditions of empathic understanding, unconditional positive regard, and genuineness, which

Rogers (1962) believes are the necessary and sufficient conditions for helping relationships in general. Within such a non-threatening supervisory atmosphere, it is believed, the counselor candidate will experience safety and freedom, thereby facilitating openness to experience and willingness to experiment.

An apparent rapproachment among the foregoing divergent schools of thought has been drawn by Patterson (1966):

The question of whether supervision is teaching or therapy has been a focus of attention, together with the problem of the influence of evaluation as a threat which interferes with the learning of the student. The consensus seems to be that supervision is not therapy, though it should be therapeutic in that supervision is accepting and minimizes the inevitable threat that must accompany evaluation.

Research Evidence

The foregoing positions were primarily conceptual and generally lack support based upon empirical findings. This section, however, will review research studies concerned with supervision.

The necessary and sufficient conditions for effective helping relationships presented by Rogers (1962) have been reconceptualized to form the basis for what Truax and Carkhuff (1967) define as the facilitative conditions of accurate empathy, non-possessive warmth or respect, genuineness, and depth of self-exploration.

The research of these investigators has focused, primarily, on the effect of the foregoing therapeutic conditions on counseling outcomes and counselor education effectiveness. Additionally, they have been concerned with the integration of therapeutic conditions and didactic processes into a holistic supervisory model (Berenson, Carkhuff, and Myrus, 1966; Carkhuff, Kratochvil, and Friel, 1968; Carkhuff and Truax, 1965; Truax and Carkhuff, 1967; Truax, Carkhuff, and Douds, 1964).

While a variety of other conceptualizations regarding supervision and counselor preparation have been investigated (Knowles and Barr, 1968; Walz, Roeber, and Gysbers, 1963), the ideas of Truax and Carkhuff seem to have been described most completely and studied most thoroughly.

The investigations of Truax and Carkhuff have aroused significant concern, even defensiveness, regarding the supervisory process in counselor preparation. For instance, Truax and Carkhuff (1967) determined that lay personnel, as well as graduate students, could be "trained" within a period of about 100 hours to offer levels of facilitative conditions close to those offered by experienced counselors. Carkhuff, Kratochvil, and Friel (1968) found that "non-clinical trainees" could communicate and discriminate levels of the therapeutic conditions with significantly more effectiveness than

"clinical trainees," and that there was a non-significant decline in the levels of facilitative conditions among "clinical trainees" as their preparation progressed. Truax, Carkhuff, and Douds (1964) have concluded that a more objective and valid system for the evaluation of student counseling behavior would be to utilize someone other than the supervisee's supervisor for purposes of evaluation. It is interesting to note that several other counselor educators who have conceptualized problems in the area of counseling supervision have reached similar conclusions (Arbuckle, 1963; Johnston and Gysbers, 1967).

Pierce and Schauble (1970), using a model developed by Carkhuff for predicting growth in interpersonal functioning, investigated changes over time in the behavior of counseling interns on the therapeutic conditions of empathy, regard, genuineness, and concreteness. Interns having supervisors who themselves were functioning at high levels of empathy, regard, genuineness, and concreteness changed significantly in a positive direction. On the other hand, interns who had supervisors offering low levels of these conditions tended to decline slightly. Therefore, these investigators concluded that individual counseling supervision can have a potent shaping influence on supervisee behavior.

In the following study, Pierce and Schauble (1970) assessed the functioning of 22 counseling and therapy practicum students, over a 20-week period, on the dimensions of empathy, regard, genuineness, and concreteness. Predictions of growth were posited on the basis of the level of functioning of individual supervisors and practicum instructors. It was determined that those counselor candidates with high level practicum instructors and high level individual supervisors showed significant gains in interpersonal functioning. The students with high level practicum instructors and low level individual supervisors also showed significant gains, but took a longer time to do so. Practicum students with low level practicum instructors and low level individual supervisors showed no growth in these conditions.

Drawing upon the formulation of Rogers, Carkhuff, and Truax, Desrosiers (1967) investigated the relationship between the levels of supervisor offered empathy, unconditional regard and congruence and changes in the self-concepts of beginning practicum students. The general hypothesis was:

Growth in counseling trainees' self-concept is a function of the level of therapeutic conditions offered by their supervisory groups and by their supervisors.

The findings of the study indicate that change in self-concept was related to the level of therapeutic conditions offered. The level of unconditionality

of regard was found to play the most important role in the change of self-concept.

A number of studies have explored sub-dimensions of the counselor preparatory experience as opposed to the total program. Hansen and Barker (1964) investigated the degree to which the level of the supervisor-supervisee relationship was related to the supervisee's level of experiencing. The subjects were three practicum supervisors and 28 graduate students in a National Defense Education Act Counseling and Guidance Institute. At the termination of the practicum experience a supervisory session relating to significant practicum experiences was audio taped. Using Gendlin's Experiencing Scale, two three-minute excerpts from each tape was rated by two judges. The results demonstrated that those practicum students who believed that they had a good supervisory relationship were less defensive and more sensitive to themselves than practicum students who gave a low rating to their relationship.

The differential effect of specific counselor preparatory approaches has also been investigated. Parry (1969) found a trend favoring experiential treatment over didactic treatment and over a control group with no treatment in raising the level of facilitative conditions. However, the differences were not statistically significant.

Payne and Gralinski (1968) studied the effects of supervisor style on naive helpers' learning of empathy. Forty-two undergraduates in psychology were divided into three groups of 14. Each subject in all three groups was asked to react to seven taped client statements as if they were the counselors. Following this, each naive helper in the experimental groups was provided a 20-minute supervisory experience. The supervisory experiences were either technique-oriented (didactic) or counseling-oriented (experiential). Also, there was a control group which received no treatment. These naive counselors responded to seven additional taped client statements. The findings of this study indicated that the naive counselors in the technique-oriented supervision and the control group offered higher levels of empathy than those counselors in the counseling-oriented supervision. The findings of Payne and Gralinski (1968) and Parry (1969) suggest that experiential supervision does not necessarily result in higher levels of empathy.

Lewis (1969) investigated the relationship between practicum supervisory methods (didactic-behavioristic or introspective-experiential) and positive attitudinal changes in counselor candidates. Didactic-behavioristic experiences entailed utilization of audio tape recordings, lectures, and other didactic experiences; the introspective-experiential approach consisted of

"sensitivity training," immediate feedback regarding the practicum student's counseling behavior and personal counseling. In an attempt to assess which approach resulted in more effective counseling, as perceived by counselors and their clients, Silverman (1969) used the design and subjects of the Lewis study (1969). His findings suggested that clients counseled by counselors prepared by the experiential method felt emotionally closer to their counselors than did clients of counselors prepared by the didactic approach. However, evaluations of the quality of the counseling did not differ, irrespective of the method used in preparing the counselor. Silverman (1969) concluded, therefore, that both experiential and didactic methods have strengths and should be utilized in the practicum.

Supportive and non-supportive supervisory experiences were investigated by Blane (1968). Where supervision focused supportively upon the strengths of the counselor's counseling skills, significant gains in empathy were made on the part of the counselor, whereas no significant gains were observed with non-supportive supervision. The immediate effects of supportive and non-supportive supervisory behavior have also been studied by Davidson and Emmer (1966). Twenty-eight graduate students enrolled in a National Defense Education Act Institute were divided into two groups of 14. Students

in one group participated in a supportive supervisory session while the students in the other group met with a nonsupportive supervisor. Then, all the students were administered a focus of concern scale and a semantic differential relating to their perceptions of practicum supervision. The results indicated that the practicum students from the nonsupportive group were less positive about practicum supervision than were those from the supportive group. Further, the results indicated that those practicum students who received the non-supportive supervision tended to shift the focus of their supervision from the client to themselves significantly more often than did those in the supportive supervisory group. The investigators qualified their findings, however, by stating that "limitations in the conceptualization and instrumentation warranted the exercise of caution in interpreting the results." Adams (1968) investigated process-oriented and task-oriented supervision and found no differences between counselors of either group with regard to interview behavior or early appearing behavior change in clients. He concluded, however, that effective counseling behavior is a balance between feminine (tender, nurturant, submissive) and masculine (aggressive, implicit, concrete) ways of functioning with clients and recommended that practicum

students be placed in a practicum which operated differently than their usual style of functioning.

Another dimension of practicum supervision which has drawn attention is the use of sensitivity groups and their contribution to the supervisory process. Bonney and Gazda (1966) required group counseling for students participating in an Advanced National Defense Education Act Summer Institute on the assumption that students should be required to accept counseling themselves (to achieve self-understanding) within the context of a counselor preparatory program. An 18-month follow-up study showed reactions which, with some reservations, were generally positive. Foreman (1967) introduced T-groups as part of a counseling practicum and found both positive and negative responses to the experience. Objective evidence of the effect of the T-groups on counseling is absent in both of these studies; furthermore, both studies rely on self-estimates from the subjects. Betz (1969) compared the effects of affective-oriented and cognitive-oriented group counseling. The affective-oriented type showed some generalization to counselor behavior in terms of counselor capacity to respond to counselee affect during the counseling interview. McKinnon (1969) found minimal evidence for support of the hypothesis that group counseling, as a concomitant of practicum, facilitates positive

perceptual reorganization and more internally-oriented verbal behavior in client interviews. The findings of Wirt, Betz, and Engle (1969) and Myrick and Pare (1971) support the general observation that short-term group experiences, in practicum, do not affect consistently a variety of outcome measures.

Ivey et al. (1968) studied the effects of "micro-counseling," utilizing video tapes, upon three different skills, attending behavior, summarization of feelings, and reflection of feelings. The results of this study suggest that attending behavior may be described in behavioral terms which are meaningful to beginning practicum students, and that it may be feasible to teach complex counseling skills in two hour blocks of time. Since research was done with paid clients, further study is required to determine the generalizability of effects to "real" clients.

Utilization of video tape methods, such as those used in the study of Ivey et al. (1968), is becoming increasingly popular with researchers. Evidence suggests that in the supervisory process the use of video tape feedback enables both the supervisee and the supervisor to observe nonverbal cues that can cause reactions in both the client and the counselor (Ryan, 1969). Pepperman (1967) found that counselors trained to use self-observations from video tapes, free from supervision,

improved significantly in their interview behavior, whereas the control group, exposed to traditional activities of closed circuit observation and formal instruction in theory, method, and techniques, showed minimal change. Poling (1968a) found that with the video tape approach, the counselors were more anxious than the counselees, but he concluded that the critiquing of video taped interviews was a valuable contribution to the practicum experience (1968b). Nelson (1968) contrasted the use of video critiques with the use of audio critiques in practicum, and found some significant change in subsequent counseling behavior, but only with respect to improved "relationship" scores; total score on the Counselor Performance Rating Scale, as well as change of self-perceptions and development of rapport, showed no significant differences in comparison with the practicum student group receiving audio critiques. Searle (1968) reported that, while not significant, there was a trend for video taping of group counseling to increase the amount of defensive behavior among the group members.

Video methods also have been used in simulation experiences during counselor preparation. Eisenberg and Delaney (1969) studied the effect of video taped simulations of counseling sessions on practicum student counseling responses. A video tape was developed to present each of 40 clients. For the first 20 clients

two segments of the video tape were developed. In one segment the client appeared alone. In the second segment an experienced counselor appeared with each client. The counselor made an appropriate counselor response lead to each client. Using this tape, a number of procedures were compared to assess their effectiveness in facilitating the acquisition, by practicum students, of the appropriate counselor response. The investigators concluded that systematic exposure to a model presented on video tape significantly influenced the practicum students' responses to clients seen on video tape, but not to live clients.

Research focusing on other dimensions of the supervisory process, the supervisor's role, for example, has been conducted by Johnston and Gysbers (1967) who found that a majority of supervisors believe in a democratic relationship with their supervisees. A study was undertaken by Walz and Roeber (1962) to investigate the orientation of practicum supervisors toward their role in the supervisory relationship. A typescript of a counseling interview was sent to 29 counselor educators, in the North Central United States, requesting that they respond to it as if it had been given to them by one of their own practicum students. In responding, the majority of the supervisors focused on counselor rather than client behavior. The findings further indicated

that 73 percent of the comments were either questioning or instructive in nature. The investigators concluded that supervisors appear to be "teaching-oriented" and seem not to have any underlying rationale for supervision. Also, noted earlier, the results of Delaney and Moore (1966) indicated that the supervisor's role, before supervision, is perceived predominantly by supervisees as that of an instructors, including the planning of duties, assigning tasks, and evaluating. Gysbers and Johnston (1965) found that the beginning practicum supervisees expected specific help from supervisors, but by the end of practicum the supervisees desired less specific help and more freedom.

In order to study supervisees' expectations of a practicum, Hansen (1965) asked 30 counselor candidates in a National Defense Education Act Institute to describe their expectations of the supervisory relationship through the use of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory. The supervisees also completed the inventory after the practicum to describe the supervisory relationship that they actually experienced. The supervisees reported that their supervisors were significantly more genuine and empathic. Also, the supervisors offered higher levels of respect and provided an overall better relationship than the supervisees had expected. Miller and Oetting (1966) attempted to identify factors that supervisees view as

important in the supervisory relationship. Their findings revealed that support, constructive criticism, and concreteness were considered significant to supervisees.

The foregoing review of positions and research indicate that a significant divergence of opinion exists, on the part of authorities, regarding the nature of practicum supervision, especially with respect to the role of the supervisor and the expectations of supervisees. While this divergence is recognized, its implications have not been evaluated. Lister's comment (1966b), with respect to the discrepancy between counselor candidate's expectations and the supervision they receive, was that the counselor candidate may, in fact, be frustrated. Gysbers and Johnston (1965), focusing on this same discrepancy, stated that it may result in a minor degree of tension which actually facilitates growth in practicum. Taking a more negative position, but just as tentative, was the comment of Miller and Oetting (1966) that the trainees' attitude may be a crucial factor in his supervision learning.

A number of discrepant positions in the literature on practicum supervision are apparent from the research and opinions noted. Such a review supports the need to explore these divergencies and to isolate, through process outcome research, those "...supervisory variables which are antecedent conditions of desirable

counselor candidate behavior." More evidence appears needed, for instance, to determine which conditions should be present during supervision to facilitate supervisee self-exploration, or which approach is most effective for a specific learning skill. Further research will minimize discrepant positions as variables in the supervisory experience are identified and evaluated.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF STUDY AND RESULTS

Hypothesis

The purpose of this study was to investigate the following question: What effect does practicum supervisor offered levels of empathy, respect, and genuineness have on the depth of self-exploration of practicum students? In order to answer this question certain conditions were established. Specifically, two practicum supervisors, during controlled supervisory sessions, offered, on a predetermined sequence (discussed below), to their supervisees high and low levels of empathy and respect. After it was determined that the high and low levels of offered conditions did, in fact, differ significantly ($p < .05$) the following null hypothesis was tested:

There will be no significant difference in supervisee levels of self-exploration under conditions of high and low levels of supervisor offered respect and empathy.

Subjects

Four graduate students in the counselor education program at the University of Florida who were currently offering, in counseling, an average level of accurate empathy, respect, and genuineness below 3.0, as measured by the Carkhuff (1969b) Scales (Appendix B), were selected to be subjects in this study. These subjects were arbitrarily designated as supervisee number one, number two, number three, or number four. At the time that these subjects received the experimental treatment they had just completed a counseling theory and laboratory practice course and were entering the first week of their initial supervised practicum experience.

Subjects offering below minimally facilitative levels were selected in order to control for the variance that could be introduced by high self-exploring and low self-exploring supervisees interacting with supervisor offered conditions. Holder, Carkhuff, and Berenson (1967) manipulated the levels of helper offered empathy, respect, genuineness, and concreteness in an initial interview with three helpees identified as functioning at high levels and three helpees functioning at low levels of these conditions. The level of self-exploration was found to be a function of helper offered

conditions for the low functioning helpees only. Thus, it appeared that, in initial supervisory sessions, only low level functioning supervisees self-explore as a function of supervisor offered high level conditions.

Two raters, who were selected according to criteria discussed in the "Selection and Preparation of Raters" section of this chapter, determined the level of conditions being offered by the beginning counselor candidates, referred to above, by rating a composite tape made by each of these students. Each tape was a composite of three 15-minute counseling sessions conducted by the beginning counselor candidate. These counseling sessions were conducted as a requirement of the laboratory portion of the introductory counseling theory course referred to earlier. One three-minute excerpt, including at a minimum one client-counselor-client interaction, was randomly selected for rating from the first, middle, and last third of each composite tape. Carkhuff (1969c) has suggested "...that it is usually most efficient to sample the briefest excerpts." Kiesler, Mathieu, and Klein (1964) have found that the reliability, range, and discriminatory power of ratings are usually independent of segment length. Excerpt location appears to provide different results. Carkhuff (1969c) suggests that random or predesignated means of sampling or a combination of both will increase the probability of securing representative

excerpts. However, evidence has been presented against the validity of random sampling (Kiesler, Klein, and Mathieu, 1965). Since there seemed to be contradictory evidence concerning the best method of rating tapes, a judgment was made to use a random means of sampling for locating excerpts for selection (Carkhuff, 1969c).

Client-counselor-client interaction samples were selected as opposed to counselor-client-counselor samples as the former allowed for the assessment of both the counselor's degree of responsiveness and its effect upon the client. These interaction samples were recorded on a master tape and submitted to the raters for rating (see Table 1).

Table 1
Mean Ratings of Supervisee Counseling Excerpts

Supervisee	E ¹	R ²	G ³
1	1.50	1.50	1.50
2	1.60	1.60	1.50
3	2.00	2.00	2.00
4	2.18	2.18	2.00

¹E = Empathic Understanding

²R = Respect

³G = Genuineness

The four subjects were requested, on a voluntary basis, "to participate in a one-hour supervisory experience which will be audio taped for purposes of research." The subjects were asked to disqualify themselves if they had any prior knowledge of the study. They were informed that a debriefing session would be provided by the investigator when the study was completed. The purpose of the debriefing would be to explain the nature of the study and to answer any questions. It was also recognized by the researcher that another reason for having a debriefing session would be to determine if any of the subjects had sensed the nature of the experimental treatment.

Supervisors

Two practicum supervisors were selected from members of the faculty of the University of Florida who were offering, in counseling, levels of respect, accurate empathy, and genuineness above 3.0, as measured by the Carkhuff (1969b) Scales. Supervisor levels of functioning were assessed by the two experienced raters, mentioned above. In keeping with the research findings of Carkhuff (1969b), Kiesler (1966), and Kiesler, Mathieu, and Klein (1964), one three-minute excerpt was taken from the first, middle, and last third of a counseling session conducted by each supervisor. Each excerpt included a client-

counselor-client interaction. The excerpts were recorded on a master tape and submitted to the raters for rating (see Table 2).

Table 2

Mean Ratings of Supervisor Counseling Excerpts

Supervisor	E ¹	R ²	G ³
A	3.5	3.1	3.1
B	3.5	3.5	3.3

¹E = Empathic Understanding

²R = Respect

³G = Genuineness

High level functioning supervisors were chosen for this study in order to control for the variance that could be introduced through the interaction of supervisee self-exploration and a low level functioning supervisor. In a study by Alexik and Carkhuff (1967), two professional helpers of identical preparation and experience, one functioning at high levels of empathy, respect, genuineness, and concreteness and the other functioning at low levels, counseled a client who, unknown to the helpers, had a response set to self-explore deeply during the first third of the interview, not at all during the middle third, and again at high levels during the last third.

Tape ratings indicated that the low level functioning helper functioned at levels related to the client's depth of self-exploration. On the other hand, the higher functioning helper offered high levels following the introduction of the experimental period. Therefore, it was inferred that during initial supervisory sessions high level functioning supervisors offer facilitative conditions independently of the levels of supervisee self-exploration.

Selection and Preparation of Raters

Two raters, referred to above, who had experience in the use of the Carkhuff (1969b) Scales, were utilized. They were experienced counselors and had been rated as functioning, in counseling, at above a 3.0 level on the facilitative conditions of empathy, respect, and genuineness. Evidence supports the predictive validity of ratings of tapes by counselors who are functioning at high levels in their own counseling (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967). Conversely, evidence indicates the counselors who are functioning at low levels in their counseling are likely to vary considerably in rating tapes when their ratings are compared with ratings made by high functioning counselors (Burstein and Carkhuff, 1969). "Simply stated, people functioning below minimally facilitative levels on the relevant dimensions distort" (Carkhuff, 1969b). Thus,

it appears that, when rating tapes, high level functioning counselors discriminate more reliably than low functioning counselors.

Rater Preparation

Each rater was presented with a set of directions (Appendix A), a copy of the relevant rating scales (Appendix B), and several score sheets (Appendix C) on which to record ratings. The raters were instructed to evaluate the experimental treatment and its effects by rating audio tapes of supervisor offered levels of facilitative conditions and supervisee levels of depth of self-exploration, during supervisory periods I, II, and III described below under "Experimental Treatment." The ratings assigned by the raters were to be recorded on the score sheets (Appendix C).

Since the raters were currently involved in rating for another study at the University of Florida and had demonstrated through the use of Ebel's (1951) coefficient to have inter-rater reliabilities of .85 or greater on ratings of the dimensions of empathy, respect, genuineness, and self-exploration, only a brief orientation to the study was necessary.

In order for these raters to evaluate supervisor and supervisee offered levels of empathy, respect, and genuineness and supervisee levels of self-exploration,

the following five-point scales which specify stages along a continuum were utilized: "Empathic Understanding," "The Communication of Respect," "Facilitative Genuineness," and "Helpee Self-Exploration" (Appendix C). These scales were written to apply to all interpersonal processes and had been validated in extensive process and outcome research (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967; Carkhuff, 1969b).

Experimental Treatment

Each practicum supervisor, arbitrarily identified for the purposes of this study either as Supervisor A, or Supervisor B, presented himself as a person who was trying to offer as much help as possible in the short time he had with the supervisee regarding problems the supervisee had experienced with either laboratory practicum clients or clients he had in his current practicum.

Supervisor A established a high level of supervisee depth of intrapersonal exploration by offering high levels of empathy and respect to supervisee number one during the first 20 minutes of their initial supervisory session. He then introduced lowered levels of empathy and respect which were maintained for a 20-minute period. Finally, this was followed by a 20-minute time period where the normally high levels were re-established.

Supervisor A then provided supervision to supervisee number two by offering 20 minutes of lowered levels of empathy and respect followed by a 20-minute time period where the supervisor's normally high conditions were offered. Finally, this was followed by a 20-minute time period where the low conditions were re-established.

Supervisor B first established a low level of supervisee depth of intrapersonal exploration by offering low levels of empathy and respect to supervisee number three during the first 20 minutes of the initial supervisory session. He then offered his normally high levels of empathy and respect which were maintained for a 20-minute period. Finally, this was followed by a 20-minute time period where the low conditions were re-established. Supervisor B then provided supervision to supervisee number four by offering high levels of empathy and respect during the first 20 minutes of their supervisory session. He then introduced lowered levels of empathy and respect which were maintained for a 20-minute period. Finally, this was followed by a 20-minute time period when the normally high levels were re-established.

An attempt was made to offer normally high levels of supervisor genuineness throughout the entire period of all supervisory sessions. This was done in order to reduce the possibility of one of the supervisees

sensing the nature of the experimental treatment. Experimental operations were checked (explained below) by determining the levels of supervisor offered empathy, respect, and genuineness, as well as supervisee depth of self-exploration, throughout all supervisory sessions.

As a cover story for the supervisor's intentional changing of conditions (and as a breaking point for research design purposes) another person knocked at the door at the end of the first 15 minutes of each supervisory session. The supervisor left the room and upon returning he said in audible tones to the second person, "Well, let me know as soon as you find out." The supervisor, it should be emphasized, was not visibly upset at any time during the interview and his voice in relating to the second person conveyed a concerned but matter of fact, business like tone. The supervisor then changed to the level of condition stipulated in the research design for that sequence of the session.

Again, as a cover story for the supervisor's changing of conditions (and as another breaking point for research design purposes) the supervisor, following another knock at the door some 15 minutes later, left the room. Upon re-entering he said in audible tones, "Well, I'm relieved to hear that." The supervisor then endeavored to provide the level of conditions specified for the third sequence of the research design.

The supervisor experimentally altered his normally high levels of accurate empathy and respect not by being phony and manipulative, but by simply selectively withholding the "best" empathic and warm responses that automatically arose in him. Conditions were not changed precipitously. The supervisor was not grossly non-empathic nor did he at any time show negative regard toward the counselor. Thus, for instance, the supervisor did not deliberately appear to misunderstand the supervisee when in fact he did understand. Instead, he simply selectively held back some of his better tentative "guesses" of what the counselor was feeling or experiencing.

Data Collection and Analysis

Excluding the initial and terminal statements, as well as time spent leaving the room, there were roughly three 15-minute periods (designated as periods I, II, and III) in each session with the four supervisees. Each of these 15-minute time periods was divided into five three-minute segments. These three-minute segments were recorded onto separate individual small spools of tape, providing 15 three-minute samples from each session or a total of 45 samples.

The 45 samples were assigned code numbers and randomly arranged for presentation to the raters. Since the segments were randomly coded the raters did

not know whether a given sample came from the early, middle, or last phases of supervision, nor did they know whether the sample was from the time period in which the supervisor was attempting to offer high or low conditions. Also, the raters were unaware of the nature of the supervisory treatment. Each of the two raters independently rated each of the 45 three-minute samples according to the criterion instruments assigned to him. The ratings were recorded on forms (Appendix C) which were returned immediately to this investigator for analysis.

Rater Reliability

Rater reliability was determined by utilizing the intraclass correlation (Guilford, 1954) which provides essentially an average intercorrelation. Two reliability scores were calculated; the first provided the mean reliability for each rater and the second gave the mean reliability for both raters. The rater reliability scores for empathy, respect, genuineness, and depth of self-exploration are presented respectively in Tables 3 through 6.

For the empathy scores the reliability was .9847, .9922; for respect, .9017, .9483; for genuineness, .9811, .9904; and for depth of self-exploration, .7456, .8543. Consequently, rater reliability for each rater as well as for both raters for empathy, respect, genuineness, and depth of self-exploration was judged acceptable.

Table 3

Rater Reliability Ratings for Empathy

Supervisee	Rater A	Rater B
1	31.5	33.5
2	43.0	43.0
3	37.0	37.0
4	47.0	46.5

Analysis of Variance on Ratings for Empathy

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Supervisee	3	239.34	79.78
Raters	1	.28	
Remainder	3	1.85	.617
TOTAL	7	241.47	

$$\bar{r}_{11} = \frac{79.78 - .617}{79.78 + .617} = .9847$$

$$\bar{r}_{22} = \frac{79.78 - .617}{79.78} = .9922$$

NOTE: \bar{r}_{11} is defined as rater reliability for one rater.

$$\bar{r}_{11} = \frac{V_p - V_e}{V_p + (K-1) V_e}$$

V_p = variance for persons (supervisees)

V_e = variance for error

K = number of raters

\bar{r}_{22} = reliability of the mean of two raters for each person (supervisees)

$$\bar{r}_{22} = \frac{V_p - V_e}{V_p}$$

Table 4

Rater Reliability Ratings for Respect

Supervisee	Rater A	Rater B
1	33.0	34.0
2	43.0	43.5
3	37.5	37.0
4	43.5	40.0

Analysis of Variance on Ratings for Respect

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Supervisee	3	117.84	39.28
Raters	1	.78	
Remainder	3	6.10	2.03
TOTAL	7	124.72	

$$\bar{r}_{11} = \frac{39.28 - 2.03}{39.28 + 2.03} = \frac{37.25}{41.31} = .9017$$

$$\bar{r}_{22} = \frac{37.25}{39.28} = .9483$$

Table 5

Rater Reliability Ratings for Genuineness

Supervisee	Rater A	Rater B
1	31.0	30.5
2	40.5	40.5
3	37.5	35.0
4	44.0	43.0

Analysis of Variance on Ratings for Genuineness

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Supervisee	3	183.75	61.25
Raters	1	2.0	
Remainder	3	1.75	.583
TOTAL	7	187.5	

$$\bar{r}_{11} = \frac{61.25 - .583}{61.25 + .583} = \frac{60.667}{61.833} = .9811$$

$$\bar{r}_{22} = \frac{61.25 - .583}{61.25} = \frac{60.667}{61.25} = .9904$$

Table 6

Rater Reliability Ratings for Depth of Self-Exploration

Supervisee	Rater A	Rater B
1	41.5	42.0
2	46.0	44.5
3	41.5	37.0
4	40.5	36.5

Analysis of Variance on Ratings for
Depth of Self-Exploration

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Supervisee	3	55.59	18.53
Raters	1	11.28	
Remainder	3	8.10	2.70
TOTAL	7	74.97	

$$\bar{r}_{11} = \frac{18.53 - 2.70}{21.23} = .7456$$

$$\bar{r}_{22} = \frac{15.83}{18.53} = .8543$$

Analyses

The differences in the predicted directions for levels of accurate empathy, respect, and genuineness were analyzed by utilizing four factors: order, phase, tape segments, and subjects nested within order. The order, phase, and tape segments were considered as fixed effects and subjects nested within order as a random effect. Tape segments were considered fixed since tape segment one was the first three minutes, tape segment two was the second three minutes, etc.; hence, they were fixed in the sequence of experimentation. The same analysis was performed on each of the four dependent variables, empathy, respect, genuineness, and depth of self-exploration. The design was a four-way cross classification.

The analysis of the data for the empathy scores, as presented in Table 7, reveals that only the interaction between phases and order was significant ($p < .01$). This was expected since the conditions high, low, high in the first order were switched to low, high, low in the second order. Similarly, the analysis of the data for the respect scores, as presented in Table 8, shows that only the interaction between phases and order was significant ($p < .01$). This was expected since the conditions of high, low, high in the first order were switched to low, high, low in the second order.

The analysis of the data for the genuineness scores, as shown in Table 9, also reveals that only the interaction between phases and order was significant. This was not expected since the supervisors attempted to maintain their normally high levels of genuineness throughout the supervisory sessions. The analysis of the data for the depth of self-exploration scores produced identical results. As shown in Table 10, only the interaction between phases and order were significant ($p < .01$). In summary, all analyses showed the interaction between order and phases to be significant ($p < .01$).

Since the foregoing F tests were significant ($p < .01$), a series of Tukey's tests of multiple comparisons were conducted to determine whether supervisor offered levels of empathy, respect, and genuineness were significantly different between periods I and II, II and III, and I and III. Specifically, Tukey's multiple comparison procedure was first used to test whether there was any difference between the first (period I), middle (period II), and last third (period III) of the supervisory session with respect to empathy scores. The results of this comparison showed that high levels of empathy differed significantly ($p < .05$) from low levels, but that no difference was detected between the two high

Table 7

Analysis of Variance on Empathy Scores

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Error Term	F
Order	1	4.96	4.96	Subj./Order	14.30
Phase	2	.03	.015	Phase X Subj./Order	.02
Tape Segment	4	.45	.11	Segment X Subj./Order	.18
Subject/Order	2	.69	.35		
Order X Phase	2	38.94	19.47	Phase X Subj./Order	27.45**
Order X Segment	4	3.66	.67	Segment X Subj./Order	1.07
Phase X Segment	8	2.30	.29	Phase X Segment X Subj./Order	1.83
Phase X Subj./Order	4	2.84	.71		
Segment X Subj./Order	8	4.98	.62		
Order X Phase X Segment	8	2.30	.29	Phase X Segment X Subj./Order	1.83
Phase X Segment X Subj./Order	16	2.52	.16		

** Significant at .01 level ($F_{4, .01}^2 = 18.00$)

Table 8

Analysis of Variance on Respect Scores

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Error Term	F
Order	1	4.13	4.13	Subj./Order	10.53
Phase	2	.18	.09	Phase X Subj./Order	.11
Tape Segment	4	.56	.14	Segment X Subj./Order	.38
Subject/Order	2	.79	.39		
Order X Phase	2	36.52	18.26	Phase X Subj./Order	23.31**
Order X Segment	4	2.65	.66	Segment X Subj./Order	1.81
Phase X Segment	8	1.26	.16	Phase X Segment X Subj./Order	1.31
Phase X Subj./Order	4	3.13	.78		
Segment X Subj./Order	8	2.93	.37		
Order X Phase X Segment	8	1.89	.24	Phase X Segment X Subj./Order	1.96
Phase X Segment X Subj./Order	16	1.93	.12		

** Significant at .01 level ($F_{4, .01}^2 = 18.00$)

Table 9

Analysis of Variance on Genuineness Scores

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Error Term	F
Order	1	4.82	4.82	Subj./Order	8.23
Phase	2	.36	.18	Phase X Subj./Order	.27
Segment	4	.80	.20	Segment X Subj./Order	.38
Subject/Order	2	1.17	.59		
Order X Phase	2	35.26	17.63	Phase X Subj./Order	26.33**
Order X Segment	4	2.43	.61	Segment X Subj./Order	1.16
Phase X Segment	8	.94	.12	Phase X Segment X Subj./Order	.77
Phase X Subj./Order	4	2.68	.67		
Segment X Subj./Order	8	4.20	.53		
Order X Phase X Segment	8	1.86	.23	Phase X Segment X Subj./Order	1.52
Phase X Segment X Subj./Order	16	2.45	.15		

** Significant at .01 level ($F_{4, .01}^2 = 18.00$)

Table 10

Analysis of Variance on Depth of Self-Exploration Scores

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Error Term	F
Order	1	.23	.23	Subj./Order	.24
Phase	2	1.71	.86	Phase X Subj./Order	2.22
Segment	4	1.45	.36	Segment X Subj./Order	1.54
Subject/Order	2	1.93	.96		
Order X Phase	2	9.94	4.97	Phase X Subj./Order	12.90*
Order X Segment	4	1.68	.42	Segment X Subj./Order	1.79
Phase X Segment	8	.80	.10	Phase X Segment X Subj./Order	.62
Phase X Subj./Order	4	1.54	.39		
Segment X Subj./Order	8	1.87	.23		
Order X Phase X Segment	8	1.57	.20	Phase X Segment X Subj./Order	1.22
Phase X Segment X Subj./Order	16	2.56	.16		

* Significant at .025 level ($F_{4, 16}^2 = 10.6$)

Table 11

Means for Phases, Order, and Segments

I					Phases II					III				
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
3.63	3.0	3.88	3.68	3.5	2.38	1.38	1.75	1.63	1.75	3.5	2.75	3.25	3.88	3.5
ORDER I					ORDER II									
1.38	1.38	1.75	1.38	2.63	3.50	3.75	3.25	3.75	3.13	1.5	2.5	1.5	1.63	1.75

Means for Main Effects

Order	$\frac{1}{2}$ 2.89	$\frac{2}{2}$ 2.32
Phases	$\frac{1}{2}$ 2.61	$\frac{2}{2}$ 2.58
Segments	$\frac{1}{2}$ 2.65	$\frac{2}{2}$ 2.46
		$\frac{4}{2}$ 2.65
		$\frac{5}{2}$ 2.71

levels or the two low levels. The results of the Tukey's multiple comparison procedure on levels of empathy offered by the two supervisors are presented in Tables 11 and 12, respectively.

Secondly, Tukey's multiple comparison procedure was used to test whether there was any difference between the first, middle, and last third of the supervisory sessions with regard to respect scores. The results of the comparison showed that high levels of respect differed significantly ($p < .05$) from low levels, but that no difference was detected between the two high levels or the two low levels. The results of this Tukey's multiple comparison procedure on levels of respect offered by the two supervisors are presented in Tables 13 and 14, respectively.

NOTE: Tukey's method is to find a critical value, D , and any comparisons $L = \bar{X}_i - \bar{X}_j$ with $|L|$ (absolute value of L) greater than D we reject the hypothesis that those two means are equal.

$$D = q_{\alpha}(p, v) \sqrt{\frac{MSE}{n}}$$

$q_{\alpha}(p, v)$ = tabulated value of the Student Range distribution.

α = probability of falsely rejecting at least one of all possible pairwise comparisons. ($\alpha = .05$)

p = the number of treatments to be compared ($p = 12$)

v = the number of degrees of freedom associated with the mean square error (MSE) ($v = 16$)

tabulated value $q_{.05}(12, 16) = 5.35$

MSE = mean square error

n = number of observations in each mean that is being compared.

Table 12

Tukey's Multiple Comparison on Levels of Empathy
Offered by Supervisor A

Levels	Means	Comparison
(a) High	3.60	(a)-(b) = 2.1*
(b) Low	1.50	(b)-(c) = 2.0*
(c) High	3.50	(a)-(c) = 0.1
(a) Low	1.20	(a)-(b) = 2.24*
(b) High	3.45	(b)-(c) = 1.6*
(c) Low	1.85	(a)-(c) = -.65

*Significant at .05 level
Critical value $D = .949$

Table 13

Tukey's Multiple Comparison on Levels of Empathy
Offered by Supervisor B

Levels	Means	Comparison
(a) Low	2.20	(a)-(b) = -1.3*
(b) High	3.50	(b)-(c) = 1.2*
(c) Low	1.70	(a)-(c) = 0.5
(a) High	3.45	(a)-(b) = 1.25*
(b) Low	2.25	(b)-(c) = -1.0*
(c) High	3.25	(a)-(c) = .25

*Significant at .05 level
Critical value $D = .949$

Table 14

Tukey's Multiple Comparison on Levels of Respect
Offered by Supervisor A

Levels	Means	Comparison
(a) High	3.60	(a)-(b) = 2.00*
(b) Low	1.60	(b)-(c) = -1.80*
(c) High	3.45	(a)-(c) = 0.15
(a) Low	1.15	(a)-(b) = -2.30*
(b) High	3.45	(b)-(c) = 1.55*
(c) Low	1.90	(a)-(c) = -0.75

*Significant at .05 level

Critical value $D = .831$

Table 15

Tukey's Multiple Comparison on Levels of Respect
Offered by Supervisor B

Levels	Means	Comparison
(a) Low	2.20	(a)-(b) = -1.35*
(b) High	3.55	(b)-(c) = 1.85*
(c) Low	1.70	(a)-(c) = 0.50
(a) High	3.30	(a)-(b) = 1.25*
(b) Low	2.25	(b)-(c) = -1.05*
(c) High	3.10	(a)-(b) = 0.20

*Significant at .05 level

Critical value $D = .831$

Thirdly, Tukey's multiple comparison procedure was used to test whether there was any difference between the first, middle, and last third of the supervisory session with respect to genuineness scores. The results of this comparison showed that high levels of genuineness differed significantly ($p < .05$) from low levels, but that no difference was detected between the two high levels or the two low levels. This result was of particular interest as the debriefing session conducted by the investigator, two weeks after the provision of the experimental treatment, revealed that none of the four subjects had sensed the nature of the study under the low levels of supervisor offered genuineness. The results of this Tukey's multiple comparison test on levels of genuineness offered by the two supervisors are presented in Tables 15 and 16, respectively.

Finally, the effect of the experimental operation on supervisees' process (supervisees' depth of intrapersonal exploration) was analyzed. Supervisee levels of self-exploration under low and high conditions were compared using a simple t-test and were found to be significantly different ($p < .001$). The mean self-exploration score under high levels of supervisor offered respect and empathy was 3.13 and under low levels, 2.33.

Table 16

Tukey's Multiple Comparison on Levels of Genuineness
Offered by Supervisor A

Levels	Means	Comparison
(a) High	3.30	(a)-(b) = 1.80*
(b) Low	1.50	(b)-(c) = 1.85*
(c) High	3.35	(a)-(c) = -0.05
(a) Low	1.05	(a)-(b) = -2.35*
(b) High	3.40	(b)-(c) = 1.65*
(c) Low	1.75	(a)-(c) = -.70

*Significant at .05 level

Critical value $D = .935$

Table 17

Tukey's Multiple Comparison on Levels of Genuineness
Offered by Supervisor B

Levels	Means	Comparison
(a) Low	2.10	(a)-(b) = 1.35*
(b) High	3.45	(b)-(c) = 1.75*
(c) Low	1.70	(a)-(c) = 0.40
(a) High	3.30	(a)-(b) = 1.15*
(b) Low	2.15	(b)-(c) = -1.10*
(c) High	3.25	(a)-(c) = 0.05

*Significant at .05 level

Critical value $D = .935$

Summary

Two practicum supervisors, arbitrarily designated for the purposes of this study either as supervisor A or supervisor B, established high and low conditions of respect and empathy which differed significantly ($p < .05$). These supervisors attempted unsuccessfully to maintain their normal levels of genuineness while offering high and low levels of respect and empathy. Hence, supervisor offered levels of genuineness differed significantly ($p < .05$) under high and low conditions of respect and empathy. A debriefing session conducted by the investigator revealed, however, that none of the four subjects sensed the nature of the experimental treatment under the low levels of supervisor offered genuineness. Establishing the foregoing conditions, the effect of the experimental treatment on supervisees' depth of self-exploration was analyzed. Supervisee levels of self-exploration under low and high conditions were compared and were found to differ significantly ($p < .001$).

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

This study was designed to investigate the following question: What effect does practicum supervisor offered levels of empathy, respect, and genuineness have on the depth of self-exploration of practicum students? In order to answer this question certain conditions were established. Specifically, two practicum supervisors, during controlled supervisory sessions, offered, on a predetermined sequence, to their supervisees high and low levels of empathy and respect. After it was determined that the high and low levels of offered conditions did, in fact, differ significantly ($p < .05$) the following null hypothesis was tested:

There will be no significant difference in supervisee levels of self-exploration under conditions of high and low levels of supervisor offered respect and empathy.

The subjects were four graduate students in the counselor education program at the University of Florida who were currently offering, in counseling, an

average level of accurate empathy, respect, and genuineness below 3.0, as measured by the Carkhuff (1969b) Scales. These subjects were arbitrarily designated as supervisee number one, number two, number three, or number four. Two practicum supervisors were selected from members of the faculty of the University of Florida who were offering, in counseling, levels of respect, accurate empathy, and genuineness above 3.0, as measured by the Carkhuff (1969b) Scales. Two experienced raters were instructed to evaluate the experimental treatment and its effects by rating audio tapes of supervisor offered levels of facilitative conditions and supervisee levels of depth of self-exploration during supervisory periods I, II, and III.

The data were analyzed by using four factors: order, phase, tape segments, and subjects nested within order. The order, phase, and tape segments were considered as fixed effects and subjects nested within order as a random effect. Tape segments were considered fixed since tape segment one was the first three minutes, tape segment two was the second three minutes, etc., hence, they were fixed in the sequence of experimentation. The same analysis was performed on each of the four dependent variables, empathy, respect, genuineness, and depth of self-exploration. The design used was a four-way cross classification.

The analyses of the data for the empathy scores and the respect scores showed only the interaction between phases and order was significant ($p < .01$). This was expected since the conditions high, low, high in the first order were switched to low, high, low in the second order. The analyses of the data on the genuineness scores also revealed that only the interaction between phases and order was significant. This was not expected since the supervisors attempted to maintain their normally high levels of genuineness throughout the supervisory sessions. The analyses of the data for the depth of self-exploration scores showed identical results. In summary, all analyses showed the interaction between order and phases to be significant ($p < .01$).

Tukey's multiple comparison procedure was used to test whether there was any difference between the first, middle, and last third of the supervisory sessions with regard to empathy scores, respect scores, and genuineness scores. The results of the comparison showed that high levels differed significantly ($p < .05$) from low levels in every variable, but that no difference was detected between the two high levels or the two low levels. These tests revealed two findings: first, that both supervisors were able to provide high and low levels of empathy and respect which differed significantly

($p < .05$), irrespective of the order in which the conditions were offered; second, that both supervisors were unsuccessful in the attempt to maintain their normal levels of genuineness while offering differing levels of empathy and respect.

Supervisee levels of self-exploration under low and high conditions were compared using a simple t-test and were found to be significantly different ($p < .001$). The mean self-exploration score under high levels of supervisor offered respect and empathy was 3.13 and under low levels, 2.33. The results of the comparisons revealed that high levels of supervisor offered respect, empathy, and genuineness facilitated deeper levels of supervisee self-exploration than did low supervisor offered conditions.

The results of this study provided statistically significant support for the prediction that supervisee depth of self-exploration is a function of supervisor offered levels of facilitative conditions. Therefore, the null hypothesis, "There will be no significant difference in supervisee levels of self-exploration under conditions of high and low levels of supervisor offered respect and empathy," was rejected.

Conclusions

From the above results, it would appear that several conclusions are warranted. Clearly, this study suggests that practicum students who are currently offering an average level of facilitative conditions below 3.0, self-explore more deeply under high supervisor offered conditions of empathy and respect than under low supervisor offered conditions. Similarly, the provision of high and low levels of supervisor offered genuineness appears related to high and low levels of supervisee self-exploration. In view of the importance of self-exploration, during supervision, to the development of health engendering counselors, it appears highly important that careful screening take place in the selection of practicum supervisors. Supervisees functioning below a 3.0 level should be supervised by supervisors offering high levels of facilitative conditions.

This study also suggests that, without prior preparation, practicum supervisors functioning, in counseling, above a 3.0 level of facilitative conditions are able to offer high and low levels of respect and empathy which differ significantly ($p < .01$), irrespective of the order of conditions offered. Consequently, high level functioning supervisors may effectively utilize the differential offering of facilitative conditions to

accelerate or decelerate certain desirable or undesirable counselor behaviors in the natural setting of practicum supervision.

In addition, the findings of this study suggest that practicum supervisors, without preparation, are unable to maintain their normally high levels of genuineness when offering different levels of respect and empathy. This finding is incongruent with the findings of an earlier study by Truax and Carkhuff (1965) which suggests that not only can helpers maintain their normally high levels of genuineness while offering high and low levels of respect and empathy, but that helper genuineness is not crucial of helpee self-exploration. Additional studies are needed to resolve this apparent conflict in findings.

A final conclusion that can be tentatively suggested is that practicum students functioning, in counseling, below a 3.0 level of facilitative conditions are unable to sense the differential offering of high and low supervisor offered facilitative conditions in supervisory sessions. Hence, the design used in this experiment provides what may prove, in future research, to be a reliable model for the investigation of the supervisory relationship.

Implications

It should be emphasized that this experiment attempted to investigate the immediate effect of high and low levels of supervisor offered facilitative conditions on supervisee depth of self-exploration. Therefore, it can not be concluded that any long range effects would yield precisely the same results. It is, however, this investigator's belief that the results obtained in the current research would be accentuated in long-range studies. It would be highly informative to determine experimentally what the results would be if the same supervisory experiences used in this study were to be used over a longer period of time.

The findings of the present study suggest several areas for future investigation. While it appears that high levels of empathy, respect, and genuineness facilitate high levels of self-exploration, no evidence is presently available relating to the effect of supervisor offered levels of concreteness of expression and self-disclosure upon supervisee self-exploration. Furthermore, future research requires the development of research designs which will make it possible to investigate the differential effects that each of the facilitative conditions has upon supervisee depth of

self-exploration. In view of the findings of this study, the findings of earlier studies which suggest that students tend to gravitate toward the levels of facilitative conditions offered by their supervisors, and the acknowledged paucity of research on practicum supervision, future research on this topic appears highly warranted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, H. J. Three practicum components associated with client early-appearing behavior change. Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968.
- Alexik, M. and Carkhuff, R. R. The effects of the manipulation of client self-exploration upon high and low functioning counselors. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1967, 23, 210-212.
- Altucher, N. Constructive use of the supervisory relationship. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 165-170.
- American Personnel and Guidance Association. Standards for the preparation of school counselors. A policy statement. Washington, D.C.: APGA, 1961.
- American Personnel and Guidance Association. Standards for the preparation of secondary school counselors -- 1967. Washington, D.C.: APGA, 1967.
- Arbuckle, D. S. The learning of counseling: Process, not product. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10, 163-168.
- Association of Counselor Education and Supervision, Committee on Counseling Effectiveness. Commitment to action in supervision; Report of a national survey of counselor supervision. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Las Vegas, March 31, 1969.
- Berenson, B. G., Carkhuff, R. R., and Myrus, P. The interpersonal functioning and training of college students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 441-446.
- Betz, R. L. Effects of group counseling as an adjunctive practicum experience. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 528-533.

- Birk, Janice M. Effects of counseling supervision method and preference on empathic understanding. Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1970.
- Blane, S. M. Immediate effect of supervisory experiences on counselor candidates. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1968, 8, 39-44.
- Bonney, W. C. and Gazda, G. Group counseling experiences: Reactions by counselor candidates. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 5, 205-211.
- Bryn, D. How to monitor an interview. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1962, 1, 162-165.
- Burstein, J. and Carkhuff, R. R. Objective client and therapist ratings of therapist offered facilitative conditions of moderate to low functioning therapists. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1969.
- Carkhuff, R. R. Critical variables in effective counselor training. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 238-245.
- Carkhuff, R. R. Helping and Human Relations. Vol. I. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969 (b).
- Carkhuff, R. R. Helping and Human Relations, Vol. II. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969 (c).
- Carkhuff, R. R. and Berenson, B. G. Beyond Counseling and Therapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Carkhuff, R. R., Kratochvil, D., and Friel, T. Effects of professional training: Communication and discrimination of facilitative conditions. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 68-74.
- Carkhuff, R. R. and Truax, C. B. Training in counseling and psychotherapy: An evaluation of an integrated didactic and experiential approach. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 331-336.
- Cash, W. L. and Munger, P. F. Counselors and their preparation. Review of Educational Research, 1966, 36, 256-263.

- Clark, C. M. On the process of counseling supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1965, 4, 64-67.
- Colby, K. M. Psychotherapeutic processes. Annual Review of Psychology, 1964, 15, 347-370.
- Davidson, T. N. and Emmer, E. T. Immediate effects of supportive and nonsupportive supervisor behavior on counselor candidates. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 6, 27-31.
- Delaney, D. J. and Moore, J. C. Student expectations of the role of practicum supervisor. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 6, 11-17.
- Desrosiers, Francois-X. A study of the personal growth of counseling trainees as a function of the level of therapeutic conditions offered by their supervisory groups and by their supervisors. Education, 1967, 119A-120A.
- Ebel, R. L. Estimation of the reliability of ratings. Psychometrika, 1951, 16, 407-424.
- Eisenberg, S. and Delaney, D. J. Using video simulation of counseling for training counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 17, 15-19.
- Ekstein, R. Supervision of psychotherapy: Is it teaching? Is it administration? Or is it therapy? Psychotherapy: Research, Theory, and Practice, 1964, 1, 137-1388.
- Ekstein R. and Wallerstein, R. S. The Teaching and Learning of Psychotherapy. New York: Basic Books, 1958.
- Foreman, M. E. T-groups: Implications for counselor supervision and preparation. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 7, 48-53.
- Guilford, J. P. Psychometric Methods. (2nd Ed.) New York: McGraw Hill, 1954.
- Gysbers, N. C. Practicum supervision theories: Learning theory. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association. Boston, April 19, 1963.

- Gysbers, N. C. Strategies for practicum supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1964, 3, 149-152.
- Gysbers, N. C. and Johnston, J. A. Expectations of a practicum supervisor's role. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1965, 68-74.
- Hall, J. H. and Warren, S. L. (eds.) Rehabilitation counselor preparation. National Rehabilitation Association and National Vocational Guidance Association, Washington, D.C., 1956.
- Hansen, J. C. Trainees' expectations of supervision in the counseling practicum. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1965, 4, 75-80.
- Hansen, J. C. and Barker, E. N. Experiencing and the supervisory relationship. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 107-111.
- Hansen, J. C. and Warner, R. W. Review of research on practicum supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1971, 10, 261-272.
- Harmon D. and Arnold, D. High school counselors evaluate their formal preparation. Personnel Guidance Journal, 1960, 39, 303-306.
- Hathaway, D. E. Effects on verbal conditioning supervisory techniques on naive helping persons. Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1968.
- Heimann, R. A. Practicum training. In C. J. Daane, C. F. Combs, and C. G. Wrenn (Eds.), Developments in Counseling. Research and Services Bulletin No. 18, Arizona State University, Bureau of Educational Research and Services, 1965.
- Hoch, E. L., Ross, A. O., and Windy, C. L. Conference on the professional preparation of clinical psychologists: A summary. American Psychologist, 1966, 21, 42-52.
- Holder, T., Carkhuff, R. R., and Berenson, B. G. Differential effects of the manipulation of therapeutic conditions upon high and low functioning clients. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 63-66.

- Hosford, R. E. Research relating to counselor supervision. In "Commitment to action in supervision: Report of a national survey of counselor supervision." Association of Counselor Education and Supervision, Committee on Counselor Effectiveness. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Las Vegas, March 31, 1969.
- Ivey, A. E., Normington, C. J., Miller, D. C., Morrill, W. H., and Haase, R. F. Microcounseling and attending training. Journal of Counseling Psychology, monograph supplement, 1968, 15, 5, Part 2.
- Johnston, J. A. and Gysbers, N. C. Essential characteristics of a supervisory relationship in counseling practicum. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 6, 335-340.
- Kell, B. L. and Mueller, W. J. Impact and Change: A Study of Counseling Relationships. New York: Appleton Century-Crofts, 1966.
- Kelz, J. W. The development and evaluation of a measure of counselor effectiveness. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44, 511-516.
- Kiesler, D. J. Basic methodological issues implicit in psychotherapy process research. American Journal of Psychotherapy, 1966, 20, 135-155.
- Kiesler, D. J., Klein, M. H., and Mathieu, P. L. Sampling from recorded therapy interview: The problem of segment location. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 337-344.
- Kiesler, D. J., Mathieu, P. L., and Klein, M. H. Sampling from the recorded therapy interview: A comparative study of different segment lengths. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1964, 28, 349-357.
- Knowles, R. T. and Barr, D. J. Pseudo-subjectivity in counseling. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1968, 46, 572-579.
- Krasner, L. The therapist as a social reinforcement machine. In H. H. Strupp and L. Luborsky (Eds.), Research in Psychotherapy, Vol. 2, Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1962.

- Krumboltz, J. D. Changing the behavior of behavior changers. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 6, 222-229.
- Lewis, G. J. Approaches to counseling practicum: A comparison of the introspective-experiential and the didactive-behavioristic paradigms. Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1969.
- Lister, J. L. Counselor experiencing: Its implications for supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 5, 55-60 (a).
- Lister, J. L. Supervised counseling experiences: Some comments. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 6, 69-72 (b).
- Mazer, G. E. and Engle, K. B. Practicum supervision: Good guys and bad guys. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1968, 7, 147-149.
- McKinnon, D. W. Group counseling with student counselors. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1969, 8, 195-200.
- Miller, D. C. and Oetting, E. R. Students react to supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 6, 73-74.
- Munger, P. F., Brown, D. F., and Needham, J. T. NDEA institute participants two years later. Personnel Guidance Journal, 1964, 42, 987-990.
- Munger, P. F. and Cash, W. L. Supervised counseling practice in the first semester of graduate training. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1963, 2, 197-200.
- Myrick, R. D. and Pare, D. D. A study of the effects of group sensitivity training with student counselor-consultants. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1971, 11, 90-96.
- Nelson, D. B. An investigation of the effects of using video tape critiques as teaching devices in a counseling practicum. Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1968.

- Parry, K. A. The effect of two training approaches on counselor effectiveness. Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1969.
- Patterson, C. H. Counseling. Annual Review of Psychology, 1966, 17, 79-110.
- Patterson, C. H. Supervising students in the counseling practicum. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 47-53.
- Payne, P. and Gralinski, D. M. Effects of supervisor style and empathy upon counselor learning. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 517-531.
- Pepperman, C. W. Effects upon counselors of the video tape recorder used in the counseling practicum. Doctoral dissertation, The Penn State University, 1967.
- Peters, H. J. and Hansen, J. D. Counseling practicum: Bases for supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1963, 2, 82-85.
- Pierce, R. M. and Schauble, P. G. Graduate training of facilitative counselors: The effects of individual supervision. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 3, 210-215.
- Poling, E. G. Video tape recordings in counseling practicum: I. environmental considerations. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1968, 7, 348-356 (a).
- Poling, E. G. Video tape recordings in counseling practicum: II. critique considerations. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1968, 8, 33-38 (b).
- Rogers, C. R. Training individuals to engage in the therapeutic process. In C. R. Strother (Ed.), Psychology and Mental Health, Washington, D.C., American Psychological Association, 1957.
- Rogers, C. R. On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
- Rogers, C. R. The interpersonal relationship: The core of guidance. Harvard Educational Review, 1962, 32, 416-429.

- Ryan, C. W. Video aids in practicum supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1969, 8, 125-129.
- Sanderson, H. Basic Concepts in Vocational Guidance. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1954.
- Searle, P. R. The effect of video tape feedback on the behavior of counseling groups. Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1968.
- Silverman, M. S. Effects of differential practicum experience on client and counselor perceptions of initial interviews. Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1969.
- Truax, C. B. and Carkhuff, R. R. Experimental manipulation of therapeutic conditions. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 119-124.
- Truax, C. B. and Carkhuff, R. R. Toward Effective Counseling and Psychotherapy: Training and Practice. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.
- Truax, C. B., Carkhuff, R. R., and Douds, J. Toward an integration of the didactic and experiential approaches to training in counseling and psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 240-247.
- Walz, G. R. Practicum supervision theories: Self theory. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Boston, April 9, 1963.
- Walz, G. R. and Roeber, E. C. Supervisor's reactions to a counseling interview. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1962, 2, 2-7.
- Walz, G. R., Roeber, E. C., and Gysbers, N. C. Integrated theory of supervision. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Boston, April 10, 1963.
- Wirt, M., Betz, R. L., and Engle, K. The effects of group counseling on the self-concepts of counselor candidates. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1969, 8, 189-194.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

DIRECTIONS TO RATERS

Tape Rating Session I

Please be sure to read all the directions carefully before proceeding.

The directions accompany (1) a copy of Carkhuff's Empathic Understanding, Genuineness, and Respect Scales, (2) copies of the Empathic Understanding, Genuineness, and Respect Score Sheets, and (3) a master tape containing a number of excerpts from counseling sessions. After familiarizing yourself with these forms, begin to rate the excerpted counseling sessions by placing the number of the empathic understanding, genuineness, or respect level which you believe most closely describe the counselor's behavior in the blank provided to the right of the segment number.

For example:	<u>Segment</u>	<u>Level</u>
	1	_____
	2	_____
	etc.	_____

Be sure to write the date and your name in the blanks provided on the score sheets. Return all your materials to me as soon as your ratings are completed.

DIRECTIONS TO RATERS

Tape Rating Session II

Please be sure to read all the directions carefully before proceeding.

The directions accompany (1) a copy of Carkhuff's Empathic Understanding, Genuineness, Respect, and Depth of Self-Exploration Scales, (2) copies of the Empathic Understanding, Genuineness, Respect, and Depth of Self-Exploration Score Sheets, and (3) a master tape containing a number of excerpts from supervisory sessions. After familiarizing yourself with these forms, begin to rate the excerpted supervisory sessions by placing the number of the empathic understanding, genuineness, or respect level which you believe most clearly describes the supervisor's behavior, and the depth of self-exploration level which you believe most clearly describes the supervisee's behavior in the blank provided to the right of the segment number.

For example:

<u>Segment</u>	<u>Level</u>
1	_____
2	_____
etc.	_____

Be sure to write the date and your name in the blanks provided on the score sheets. Return all your materials to me as soon as your ratings are completed.

APPENDIX B

SCALE 1 EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES

(Robert R. Carkhuff)

LEVEL 1

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the first person either do not attend to or detract significantly from the verbal and behavioral expressions of the second person(s) in that they communicate significantly less of the second person's feelings than the second person has communicated himself.

Examples: The first person communicates no awareness of even the most obvious, expressed surface feelings of the second person. The first person may be bored or uninterested or simply operating from a preconceived frame of reference which totally excludes that of the other person(s).

In summary, the first person does everything but express that he is listening, understanding, or being sensitive to even the feelings of the other person in such a way as to detract significantly from the communications of the second person.

LEVEL 2

While the first person responds to the expressed feelings of the second person(s), he does so in such a way that he subtracts noticeable affect from the communications of the second person.

Examples: The first person may communicate some awareness of obvious surface feelings of the second person, but his communications drain off a level of the affect and distort the level of meaning. The first person may communicate his own ideas of what may be going on, but these are not congruent with the expressions of the second person.

In summary, the first person tends to respond to other than what the second person is expressing or indicating.

LEVEL 3

The expressions of the first person in response to the expressed feelings of the second person(s) are essentially interchangeable with those of the second person in that they express essentially the same affect and meaning.

Example: The first person responds with accurate understanding of the surface feelings of the second person but may not respond to or may misinterpret the deeper feelings.

In summary, the first person is responding so as to neither subtract from nor add to the expressions of the second person; but he does not respond accurately to how that person really feels beneath the surface feelings. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

LEVEL 4

The responses of the first person add noticeably to the expressions of the second person(s) in such a way as to express feelings a level deeper than the second person was able to express himself.

Example: The facilitator communicates his understanding of the expressions of the second person at a level deeper than they were expressed, and thus enables the second person to experience and/or express feelings he was unable to express previously.

In summary, the facilitator's responses add deeper feeling and meaning to the expressions of the second person.

LEVEL 5

The first person's responses add significantly to the feeling and meaning of the expressions of the second person(s) in such a way as to (1) accurately express feelings levels below what the person himself was able to express or (2) in the event of on going deep self-exploration on the second person's part, to be fully with him in his deepest moments.

Examples: The facilitator responds with accuracy to all of the person's deeper as well as surface feelings. He is "together" with the second person or "tuned in" on his wave length. The facilitator and the other person might proceed together to explore previously unexplored areas of human existence.

In summary, the facilitator is responding with a full awareness of who the other person is and a comprehensive and accurate empathic understanding of his deepest feelings.

SCALE 2 THE COMMUNICATION OF RESPECT IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES

(Robert R. Carkhuff)

LEVEL 1

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the first person communicate a clear lack of respect (or negative regard) for the second person(s).

Example: The first person communicates to the second person that the second person's feelings and experiences are not worthy of consideration or that the second person is not capable of acting constructively. The first person may become the sole focus of evaluation.

In summary, in many ways the first person communicates a total lack of respect for the feelings, experiences, and potentials of the second person.

LEVEL 2

The first person responds to the second person in such a way as to communicate little respect for the feelings, experiences, and potentials of the second person.

Example: The first person may respond mechanically or passively or ignore many of the feelings of the second person.

In summary, in many ways the first person displays a lack of respect or concern for the second person's feelings, experiences, and potentials.

LEVEL 3

The first person communicates a positive respect and concern for the second person's feelings, experiences, and potentials.

Example: The first person communicates respect and concern for the second person's ability to express himself and to deal constructively with his life situation.

In summary, in many ways the first person communicates that who the second person is and what he does matters to the first person. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

LEVEL 4

The facilitator clearly communicates a very deep respect and concern for the second person.

Example: The facilitator's responses enables the second person to feel free to be himself and to experience being valued as an individual.

In summary, the facilitator communicates a very deep caring for the feelings, experiences, and potentials of the second person.

LEVEL 5

The facilitator communicates the very deepest respect for the second person's worth as a person and his potentials as a free individual.

Example: The facilitator cares very deeply for the human potentials of the second person.

In summary, the facilitator is committed to the value of the other person as a human being.

SCALE 3

FACILITATIVE GENUINENESS IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES

(Robert R. Carkhuff)

LEVEL 1

The first person's verbalizations are clearly unrelated to what he is feeling at the moment, or his only genuine responses are negative in regard to the second person(s) and appear to have a totally destructive effect upon the second person(s).

Example: The first person may be defensive in his interaction with the second person(s) and this defensiveness may be demonstrated in the content of his words or his voice quality. Where he is defensive he does not employ his reaction as a basis for potentially valuable inquiry into the relationship.

In summary, there is evidence of a considerable discrepancy between the inner experiencing of the first person(s) and his current verbalizations. Where there is no discrepancy, the first person's reactions are employed solely in a destructive fashion.

LEVEL 2

The first person's verbalizations are slightly unrelated to what he is feeling at the moment, or when his responses are genuine they are negative in regard to the second person; the first person does not appear to know how to employ his negative reactions constructively as a basis for inquiry into the relationship.

Example: The first person may respond to the second person(s) in a "professional" manner that has a rehearsed quality or a quality concerning the way a helper "should" respond in that situation.

In summary, the first person is usually responding according to his prescribed role rather than expressing what he personally feels or means. When he is genuine his responses are negative and he is unable to employ them as a basis for further inquiry.

LEVEL 3

The first person provides no "negative" cues between what he says and what he feels, but he provides no positive cues to indicate a really genuine response to the second person(s).

Example: The first person may listen and follow the second person(s) but commits nothing more of himself.

In summary, the first person appears to make appropriate responses that do not seem insincere but that do not reflect any real involvement either. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

LEVEL 4

The facilitator presents some positive cues indicating a genuine response (whether positive or negative) in a nondestructive manner to the second person(s).

Example: The facilitator's expressions are congruent with his feelings, although he may be somewhat hesitant about expressing them fully.

In summary, the facilitator responds with many of his own feelings, and there is no doubt as to whether he really means what he says. He is able to employ his responses, whatever their emotional content, as a basis for further inquiry into the relationship.

LEVEL 5

The facilitator is freely and deeply himself in a nonexploitative relationship with the second person(s).

Example: The facilitator is completely spontaneous in his interaction and open to experiences of all types, both pleasant and hurtful. In the event of hurtful responses the facilitator's comments are employed constructively to open a further area of inquiry for both the facilitator and the second person.

In summary, the facilitator is clearly being himself and yet employing his own genuine responses constructively.

SCALE 4 HELPEE SELF-EXPLORATION IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES

(Robert R. Carkhuff)

LEVEL 1

The second person does not discuss personally relevant material, either because he has had no opportunity to do such or because he is actively evading the discussion even when it is introduced by the first person.

Example: The second person avoids any self-descriptions or self-exploration or direct expression of feelings that would lead him to reveal himself to the first person.

In summary, for a variety of possible reasons the second person does not give any evidence of self-exploration.

LEVEL 2

The second person responds with discussion to the introduction of personally relevant material by the first person but does so in a mechanical manner and without the demonstration of emotional feelings.

Example: The second person simply discusses the material without exploring the significance or the meaning of the material or attempting further exploration of that feeling in an effort to uncover related feelings or material.

In summary, the second person responds mechanically and remotely to the introduction of personally relevant material by the first person.

LEVEL 3

The second person voluntarily introduces discussions of personally relevant material but does so in a mechanical manner and without the demonstration of emotional feeling.

Example: The emotional remoteness and mechanical manner of the discussion gives the discussion a quality of being rehearsed.

In summary, the second person introduces personally relevant material but does so without spontaneity or emotional proximity and without an inward probing to discover new feelings and experiences.

LEVEL 4

The second person voluntarily introduces discussions of personally relevant material with both spontaneity and emotional proximity.

Example: The voice quality and other characteristics of the second person are very much "with" the feelings and other personal materials that are being verbalized.

In summary, the second person introduces personally relevant discussions with spontaneity and emotional proximity but without a distinct tendency toward inward probing to discover new feelings and experiences.

LEVEL 5

The second person actively and spontaneously engages in an inward probing to discover new feelings and experiences about himself and his world.

Example: The second person is searching to discover new feelings concerning himself and his world even though at the moment he may perhaps be doing so fearfully and tentatively.

In summary, the second person is fully and actively focusing upon himself and exploring himself and his world.

APPENDIX C

Ratings of Supervisee Counseling Excerpts

Score Sheet 1

Random Segment Number	E	R	G	Dx
14				
12				
18				
4				
7				
17				
15				
3				
30				
20				
13				
36				
8				
2				
35				
6				
19				
21				

E = accurate empathy
 R = respect
 G = genuineness
 Dx = self-exploration

Ratings of Supervisee Counseling Excerpts

Score Sheet 2

Random Segment Number	E	R	G	Dx
25				
22				
10				
16				
29				
32				
28				
11				
34				
23				
31				
5				
26				
9				
24				
33				
1				
27				

E = accurate empathy
R = respect
G = genuineness
Dx = self-exploration

Ratings of Supervision Session Tape Segments

Score Sheet 3

Random Segment Number	E	R	G	Dx
23				
3				
85				
12				
4				
61				
9				
78				
40				
8				
14				
43				
50				
63				
59				

E = accurate empathy
R = respect
G = genuineness
Dx = self-exploration

Ratings of Supervision Session Tape Segments

Score Sheet 4

Random Segment Number	E	R	G	Dx
45				
68				
27				
69				
41				
46				
89				
37				
58				
64				
81				
87				
51				
29				
17				

E = accurate empathy
R = respect
G = genuineness
Dx = self-exploration

Ratings of Supervision Session Tape Segments

Score Sheet 5

Random Segment Number	E	R	G	Dx
15				
80				
18				
12				
28				
86				
10				
30				
84				
38				
20				
16				
49				
31				
52				

E = accurate empathy
R = respect
G = genuineness
Dx = self-exploration

Ratings of Supervision Session Tape Segments

Score Sheet 6

Random Segment Number	E	R	G	Dx
90				
62				
65				
48				
72				
73				
34				
67				
57				
39				
44				
13				
33				
5				
76				

E = accurate empathy
R = respect
G = genuineness
Dx = self-exploration

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

William James Lennon, Jr. was born on July 16, 1940, in New York City. He is the son of the late William James Lennon and Rita Evelyn Grady Lennon. In June, 1958, he was graduated from St. Petersburg High School, St. Petersburg, Florida, and in June, 1961, he received an Associate of Arts Certificate from St. Petersburg Junior College, St. Petersburg, Florida. From September, 1961, to July, 1965, he was employed in the electronics industry, first as a draftsman and later as chief electromechanical design draftsman for Atlantic Engineering Corporation, Huntsville, Alabama.

In June, 1967, he received the degree of Bachelor of Arts with a major in political science and in December, 1969, the degree of Master of Education with a major in psychological counseling from the Department of Counselor Education at the University of Florida. From September, 1968, until June, 1969, he was employed as a counselor to residents by the University of Florida and from September, 1969, to January, 1971, as a rehabilitation counselor for the State of Florida. In January, 1971, he was awarded a Rehabilitation Services Administration Fellowship and has been enrolled in the graduate school of the University of Florida until the present time.

He has accepted a position as a psychologist with the North Central Florida Community Mental Health Center coordinating the consultation and education program.

William James Lennon is married to the former Geraldine Schnittker and is the father of three lovely children, William James III, Rita Lorene, and Geraldine Kathleen. He is a member of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, the National Rehabilitation Counselor Association, and the American Rehabilitation Counselor Association.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Robert O. Stripling

Robert O. Stripling, Chairman
Professor of Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Benjamin Barger

Benjamin Barger
Professor of Psychology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

O. Bruce Thomason

O. Bruce Thomason
Professor of Rehabilitation
Counseling

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

William B. Ware

William B. Ware
Assistant Professor of Education

This dissertation was submitted to the Dean of the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

August, 1972

B.L. Sharf by M.C. Baker
Dean, College of Education

Dean, Graduate School